

also like to thank our Speaker, our Majority Leader, our Whip, Mr. CLYBURN, Chairwoman BEATTY, Chairman BENNIE THOMPSON, and Congressman BUTTERFIELD for moving this legislation forward with the urgency that it requires.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3005, which will remove shameful monuments to slavery, segregation, and white supremacy from the U.S. Capitol. In 2017, in the wake of the white nationalist rally in Charlottesville, I introduced the Confederate Monument Removal Act to remove all statues of people who voluntarily served the Confederacy from the Capitol building, so thank you for including this in this current bill. Venerating those who took up arms against the United States to preserve slavery is an affront to the human dignity of all Americans.

These painful symbols of bigotry and racism have no place in our society and certainly should not be enshrined in the U.S. Capitol. Following our historic vote on Juneteenth, it is past time for Congress to stop glorifying the men who committed treason against the United States to keep African Americans in chains.

The movement to honor Confederate soldiers was a deliberate act to rewrite history and diminish the role of slavery in the outbreak of hostilities between the North and the South. The Confederacy sought to uphold the institution of slavery and maintain a racial hierarchy that brutalized and oppressed Black people. This ideology of white supremacy led to the rise of Confederate memorials in the 20th century. Most Confederate statutes were erected during periods of extreme civil rights tension, not in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War. Placed in public spaces, they were testaments to the enduring notion of white supremacy and used to push back against the movement for equality for African Americans. They are symbols of white supremacy and hatred, not Southern heritage. They don't belong here in the U.S. Capitol.

We are in a critical moment to act. The removal of Confederate statues from the U.S. Capitol is an important step in confronting our nation's painful legacy of slavery, racism, and oppression. As a descendant of enslaved Africans, I support this bill and I ask for an 'aye' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SCHRIER). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

## IG INDEPENDENCE AND EMPOWERMENT ACT

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I call up the bill (H.R. 2662) to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Oversight and Reform, printed in the bill, is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

### H.R. 2662

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “IG Independence and Empowerment Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

#### TITLE I—INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Amendment.

#### TITLE II—CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Change in status of Inspector General offices.

Sec. 203. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.

#### TITLE III—VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS

Sec. 301. Vacancy of Inspector General positions.

#### TITLE IV—COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY TRANSPARENCY

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Additional information to be included in requests and reports to Congress.

Sec. 403. Availability of information to members of Congress regarding certain allegations of wrongdoing closed without referral.

Sec. 404. Semiannual report.

Sec. 405. Additional reports; rules of construction.

Sec. 406. Membership of Integrity Committee.

Sec. 407. Requirement to refer allegations of wrongdoing against Inspector General to Integrity Committee.

Sec. 408. Requirement to report final disposition to Congress.

#### TITLE V—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Additional authority provisions for Inspectors General.

#### TITLE VI—INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL

Sec. 601. Short title.

Sec. 602. Investigations of Department of Justice personnel.

#### TITLE VII—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS

Sec. 701. Short title.

Sec. 702. Office of Inspector General whistleblower complaints.

#### TITLE VIII—NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Sec. 801. Notice of ongoing investigations when there is a change in status of Inspector General.

#### TITLE IX—COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY APPROPRIATION

Sec. 901. CIGIE appropriation.

#### TITLE X—NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INSPECTORS GENERAL ACCESS

Sec. 1001. Notice of refusal to provide information or assistance to Inspectors General.

#### TITLE XI—ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING

Sec. 1101. Short title.

Sec. 1102. Enhancements to Inspector General Training.

#### TITLE XII—BUDGETARY EFFECTS

Sec. 1201. Determination of budgetary effects.

#### TITLE XIII—SEVERABILITY

Sec. 1301. Severability.

### TITLE I—INSPECTOR GENERAL INDEPENDENCE

#### SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Independence Act”.

#### SEC. 102. AMENDMENT.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in section 3(b)—

(A) by striking “An Inspector General” and inserting:

“(1) An Inspector General”;

(B) by inserting after “by the President” the following: “in accordance with paragraph (2)”;

and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The President may remove an Inspector General only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to paragraph (1)):

“(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

“(B) Documented neglect of duty.

“(C) Documented malfeasance.

“(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

“(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

“(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

“(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

“(H) Documented abuse of authority.

“(I) Documented inefficiency.”;

(2) in section 8G(e)(2), by adding at the end the following: “An Inspector General may be removed only for any of the following grounds (and the documentation of any such ground shall be included in the communication required pursuant to this paragraph):

“(A) Documented permanent incapacity.

“(B) Documented neglect of duty.

“(C) Documented malfeasance.

“(D) Documented conviction of a felony or conduct involving moral turpitude.

“(E) Documented knowing violation of a law or regulation.

“(F) Documented gross mismanagement.

“(G) Documented gross waste of funds.

“(H) Documented abuse of authority.

“(I) Documented inefficiency.”.

### TITLE II—CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION OF CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

#### SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Protection Act”.

#### SEC. 202. CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OFFICES.

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICES.—Paragraph (1) of section 3(b) of

the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,” after “is removed from office”;

(2) by inserting “, change in status,” after “any such removal”; and

(3) by inserting “, change in status,” after “before the removal”.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting “, is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status,” after “office”;

(2) by inserting “, change in status,” after “any such removal”; and

(3) by inserting “, change in status,” after “before the removal”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 203. PRESIDENTIAL EXPLANATION OF FAILURE TO NOMINATE AN INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3349d the following new section:

##### “§3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General

“If the President fails to make a formal nomination for a vacant Inspector General position that requires a formal nomination by the President to be filled within the period beginning on the date on which the vacancy occurred and ending on the day that is 210 days after that date, the President shall communicate, within 30 days after the end of such period, to Congress in writing—

“(1) the reasons why the President has not yet made a formal nomination; and

“(2) a target date for making a formal nomination.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3349d the following new item:

“3349e. Presidential explanation of failure to nominate an Inspector General.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any vacancy first occurring on or after that date.

#### TITLE III—VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS

##### SEC. 301. VACANCY OF INSPECTOR GENERAL POSITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if an Inspector General position that requires appointment by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to be filled is vacant, the first assistant of such position shall perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General temporarily in an acting capacity subject to the time limitations of section 3346.

“(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), if for purposes of carrying out paragraph (1) of this subsection, by reason of absence, disability, or vacancy, the first assistant to the position of Inspector General is not available to perform the functions and duties of the Inspector General, an acting Inspector General shall be appointed by the President from among individuals serving in an office of any Inspector General, provided that—

“(A) during the 365-day period preceding the date of death, resignation, or beginning of inability to serve of the applicable Inspector General, the individual served in a position in an office of any Inspector General for not less than 90 days; and

“(B) the rate of pay for the position of such individual is equal to or greater than the min-

imum rate of pay payable for a position at GS-15 of the General Schedule.”.

(b) APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any vacancy first occurring with respect to an Inspector General position on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### TITLE IV—COUNCIL OF INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY TRANSPARENCY

##### SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Integrity Committee Transparency Act of 2021”.

##### SEC. 402. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED IN REQUESTS AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “, the length of time the Integrity Committee has been evaluating the allegation of wrongdoing, and a description of any previous written notice provided under this clause with respect to the allegation of wrongdoing, including the description provided for why additional time was needed.”; and

(2) in paragraph (8)(A)(ii), by inserting “or corrective action” after “disciplinary action”.

##### SEC. 403. AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS REGARDING CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING CLOSED WITHOUT REFERRAL.

Section 11(d)(5)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an allegation of wrongdoing made by a member of Congress that is closed by the Integrity Committee without referral to the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee to initiate an investigation, the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall, not later than 60 days after closing such allegation, provide a written description of the nature of the allegation of wrongdoing and how the Integrity Committee evaluated the allegation of wrongdoing to—

“(aa) the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives;

“(bb) the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

“(cc) a member of the House of Representatives who has the support of any seven members of the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; or

“(dd) a member of the Senate who has the support of any five members of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

“(II) REQUIREMENT TO FORWARD.—The Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall forward any written description or update provided under this clause to the members of the Integrity Committee and to the Chairperson of the Council.”.

##### SEC. 404. SEMIANNUAL REPORT.

Section 11(d)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended to read as follows:

“(9) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—On or before May 31, 2022, and every six months thereafter, the Council shall submit to Congress and the President a report on the activities of the Integrity Committee during the immediately preceding six-month periods ending March 31 and September 30, which shall include the following with respect to allegations of wrongdoing that are made against Inspectors General and staff members of the various Offices of Inspector General described under paragraph (4)(C):

“(A) An overview and analysis of the allegations of wrongdoing disposed of by the Integrity Committee, including—

“(i) analysis of the positions held by individuals against whom allegations were made, including the duties affiliated with such positions;

“(ii) analysis of the categories or types of the allegations of wrongdoing; and

“(iii) a summary of disposition of all the allegations.

“(B) The number of allegations referred to the Department of Justice or the Office of Special Counsel, including the number of allegations referred for criminal investigation.

“(C) The number of allegations referred to the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee for investigation, a general description of the status of such investigations, and a summary of the findings of investigations completed.

“(D) An overview and analysis of allegations of wrongdoing received by the Integrity Committee during any previous reporting period, but remained pending during some part of the six months covered by the report, including—

“(i) analysis of the positions held by individuals against whom allegations were made, including the duties affiliated with such positions;

“(ii) analysis of the categories or types of the allegations of wrongdoing; and

“(iii) a summary of disposition of all the allegations.

“(E) The number and category or type of pending investigations.

“(F) For each allegation received—

“(i) the date on which the investigation was opened;

“(ii) the date on which the allegation was disposed of, as applicable; and

“(iii) the case number associated with the allegation.

“(G) The nature and number of allegations to the Integrity Committee closed without referral, including the justification for why each allegation was closed without referral.

“(H) A brief description of any difficulty encountered by the Integrity Committee when receiving, evaluating, investigating, or referring for investigation an allegation received by the Integrity Committee, including a brief description of—

“(i) any attempt to prevent or hinder an investigation; or

“(ii) concerns about the integrity or operations at an Office of Inspector General.”.

##### SEC. 405. ADDITIONAL REPORTS; RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Section 11(d) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(14) ADDITIONAL REPORTS.—

“(A) REPORT TO INSPECTOR GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Integrity Committee shall submit a report immediately whenever the Chairperson of the Integrity Committee becomes aware of particularly serious or flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies relating to the administration of programs and operations of an Office of Inspector General. The report shall be sent to the Inspector General who leads the Office of Inspector General at which the serious or flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies were alleged.

“(B) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Inspector General of the Office identified by the Integrity Committee shall submit any such report to the House Committee on Oversight and Reform and the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs within seven calendar days from the time the Inspector General receives the report together with a report by the Inspector General at the Office identified by the Integrity Committee containing any comments such Inspector General deems appropriate.

“(15) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

“(A) PUBLIC DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize the public disclosure of information which is—

“(i) prohibited from disclosure by any other provision of law;

“(ii) required by Executive order to be protected from disclosure in the interest of national defense or national security or in the conduct of foreign affairs; or

“(iii) a part of an ongoing criminal investigation.

“(B) PROVISION OF REPORT TO REQUESTING MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Subject to any other provision of law that would otherwise prohibit disclosure of such information, the information described in subparagraph (A) may be provided to any Member of Congress upon request of the Member.

“(16) PROHIBITED DISCLOSURES.—The Integrity Committee may not provide or otherwise disclose to Congress or the public any information that reveals the personally identifiable information of an individual who alleges wrongdoing to the Integrity Committee under this subsection unless the Integrity Committee first obtains the consent of the individual.”.

#### SEC. 406. MEMBERSHIP OF INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.

Section 11(d)(2) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following:

“(iv) The individual appointed under subparagraph (C).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) APPOINTMENT OF FORMER INSPECTOR GENERAL TO COMMITTEE.—

“(i) APPOINTMENT.—The Chairperson of the Council shall appoint an individual who prior to the date of such appointment served as an Inspector General (as that position is described in section 3(a) and section 8G(a)(6)), and who has upheld the highest standards of integrity and professionalism while serving and since leaving service as an Inspector General, as determined by the Chairperson, to serve as a member of the Committee unless no such individual is available or willing to serve as a member of the Committee at the time of the appointment.

“(ii) INITIAL TERM.—The individual appointed under clause (i) shall serve at the pleasure of the Chairperson of the Council for a 2-year term.

“(iii) ADDITIONAL TERM.—The Chairperson of the Council may reappoint the individual appointed under clause (i) to serve at the pleasure of the Chairperson of the Council for an additional term not to exceed 2 years.

“(iv) COMPENSATION.—

“(I) SPECIAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE DESIGNATION.—The individual appointed under clause (i) shall be considered a special government employee pursuant to section 202(a) of title 18, United States Code.

“(II) COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.—An individual appointed under clause (i) may not receive compensation at a rate in excess of the rate of basic pay for level IV of the executive schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, and any such individual, while engaged in the performance of their duties away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of such title for persons engaged intermittently in the Government service.

“(III) ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES.—The Chairperson of the Council may accept volunteer services from the individual appointed under this subparagraph without regard to section 1342 of title 31, United States Code.

“(IV) PROVISIONS RELATING TO REEMPLOYMENT.—

“(aa) The Chairperson of the Council may reemploy annuitants.

“(bb) The employment of annuitants under this paragraph shall be subject to the provisions of section 9902(g) of title 5, United States Code, as if the Council was the Department of Defense.”.

#### SEC. 407. REQUIREMENT TO REFER ALLEGATIONS OF WRONGDOING AGAINST INSPECTOR GENERAL TO INTEGRITY COMMITTEE.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Section 11(d)(4) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), in the heading, by striking “REQUIREMENT” and inserting “ALLEGATIONS AGAINST STAFF MEMBERS”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) ALLEGATIONS AGAINST INSPECTORS GENERAL.—An Inspector General shall refer to the Integrity Committee any allegation of wrongdoing against that Inspector General.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 11(d)(1) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “(4)(C)” and inserting “(4)(D)”.

#### SEC. 408. REQUIREMENT TO REPORT FINAL DISPOSITION TO CONGRESS.

Section 11(d)(8) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by inserting “contemporaneously with the submission of the report under clause (ii),” before “submit”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and other congressional committees of jurisdiction,” after “Integrity Committee”.

#### TITLE V—ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL

##### SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “IG Subpoena Authority Act”.

##### SEC. 502. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY PROVISIONS FOR INSPECTORS GENERAL.

The Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by inserting after section 6 the following new section:

##### “SEC. 6A. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY.

“(a) TESTIMONIAL SUBPOENA AUTHORITY.—In addition to the authority otherwise provided by this Act and in accordance with the requirements of this section, each Inspector General, in carrying out the provisions of this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the provisions of the authorizing statute), is authorized to require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of witnesses as necessary in the performance of the functions assigned to the Inspector General by this Act (or in the case of an Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act, the functions assigned by the authorizing statute), which in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, such subpoena shall be enforceable by order of any appropriate United States district court. An Inspector General may not require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of any Federal employee or employee of a designated Federal entity, but may use other authorized procedures.

“(b) LIMITATION OF DELEGATION.—The authority to issue a subpoena under subsection (a) may only be delegated to an official performing the functions and duties of the Inspector General when an Inspector General position is vacant or when the Inspector General is unable to perform the functions and duties of the Office.

“(c) PANEL REVIEW BEFORE ISSUANCE.—

“(1) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—

“(A) REQUEST FOR APPROVAL BY SUBPOENA PANEL.—Before the issuance of a subpoena described in subsection (a), an Inspector General shall submit a request for approval to issue a subpoena to a panel (in this section, referred to as the ‘Subpoena Panel’), which shall be comprised of three Inspectors General of the Council

of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, who shall be designated by the Inspector General serving as Chairperson of the Council.

“(B) PROTECTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—The information contained in the request submitted by an Inspector General under subparagraph (A) and the identification of a witness shall be protected from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. Any request for disclosure of such information shall be submitted to the Inspector General requesting the subpoena.

“(2) TIME TO RESPOND.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Subpoena Panel shall approve or deny a request for approval to issue a subpoena not later than 10 calendar days after the submission of such request.

“(B) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PANEL.—If the Subpoena Panel determines that additional information is necessary to approve or deny a request submitted by an Inspector General under paragraph (1)(A), the Subpoena Panel shall request such information from the Inspector General and shall approve or deny the request submitted by the Inspector General under paragraph (1)(A) not later than 20 calendar days after the submission of the request under such paragraph.

“(3) DENIAL BY PANEL.—If a majority of the Subpoena Panel denies the approval of a subpoena, that subpoena may not be issued.

“(d) NOTICE TO ATTORNEY GENERAL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Subpoena Panel approves a subpoena under subsection (c), the Inspector General shall notify the Attorney General that the Inspector General intends to issue the subpoena.

“(2) DENIAL FOR INTERFERENCE WITH AN ONGOING INVESTIGATION.—Not later than 10 calendar days after the date on which the Attorney General is notified pursuant to paragraph (1), the Attorney General may object to the issuance of the subpoena because the subpoena will interfere with an ongoing investigation and the subpoena may not be issued.

“(3) ISSUANCE OF SUBPOENA APPROVED.—If the Attorney General declines to object or fails to object to the issuance of the subpoena during the 10-day period described in paragraph (2), the Inspector General may issue the subpoena.

“(e) GUIDELINES.—The Chairperson of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, in consultation with the Attorney General, shall prescribe guidelines to carry out this section.

“(f) INSPECTOR GENERAL DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘Inspector General’ includes each Inspector General established under this Act and each Inspector General or Special Inspector General not established under this Act.

“(g) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this section shall not affect the exercise of authority by an Inspector General of testimonial subpoena authority established under another provision of law.”;

(2) in section 5(a)—

(A) in paragraph (21)(B), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (22), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(23) a description of the use of subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses authorized under section 6A.”; and

(3) in section 8G(g)(1), by inserting “6A,” before “and 7”.

#### TITLE VI—INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL

##### SEC. 601. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Access Act”.

##### SEC. 602. INVESTIGATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PERSONNEL.

Section 8E of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—  
(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and paragraph (3)”;

(B) by striking paragraph (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraph (3)”;

(2) in subsection (d), by striking “, except with respect to allegations described in subsection (b)(3).”

#### **TITLE VII—OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS**

##### **SEC. 701. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Enhanced Whistleblower Engagement Act”.

##### **SEC. 702. OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINTS.**

(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION COORDINATOR.—Section 3(d)(1)(C) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting “, including employees of that Office of Inspector General” after “employees”; and

(2) in clause (iii), by inserting “(including the Integrity Committee of that Council)” after “and Efficiency”.

(b) COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY.—Section 11(c)(5)(B) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by striking “, allegations of reprisal,” and inserting the following: “and allegations of reprisal (including the timely and appropriate handling and consideration of protected disclosures and allegations of reprisal that are internal to an Office of Inspector General)”.

#### **TITLE VIII—NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

##### **SEC. 801. NOTICE OF ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS WHEN THERE IS A CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL.**

(a) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 3 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(h) Not later than 15 days after an Inspector General is removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred to another position or location within an establishment, the acting Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a list of all audits and investigations being conducted, supervised, coordinated by the Office at the time the Inspector General was removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred.”.

(b) CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(3) Not later than 15 days after an Inspector General is removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred to another position or location within an designated Federal entity, the acting Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a list of all audits and investigations being conducted, supervised, coordinated by the Office at the time the Inspector General was removed, placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, or transferred.”.

#### **TITLE IX—COUNCIL OF THE INSPECTORS GENERAL ON INTEGRITY AND EFFICIENCY APPROPRIATION**

##### **SEC. 901. CIGIE APPROPRIATION.**

(a) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—Section 11(c)(3) of the Inspector General Act of

1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any funds available in the Inspectors General Council Fund established under subparagraph (B), there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary, to remain available until expended, to carry out the functions and duties of the Council under this subsection.”.

(b) REMOVING COUNCIL FUNDING FROM INDIVIDUAL INSPECTOR GENERAL BUDGET REQUESTS.—Section 6(g) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “, and any resources necessary to support the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency. Resources necessary to support the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency shall be specifically identified and justified in the budget request”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—  
(A) in subparagraph (B), by adding “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of receipt by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency of an appropriation for the Council to carry out the functions and duties of the Council under section 11 of the Inspector General Act (5 U.S.C. App. 11), as amended under this section.

#### **TITLE X—NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INSPECTORS GENERAL ACCESS**

##### **SEC. 1001. NOTICE OF REFUSAL TO PROVIDE INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE TO INSPECTORS GENERAL.**

Section 6(c) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If the information or assistance that is the subject of a report under paragraph (2) is not provided to the Inspector General by the date that is 30 days after the report is made, the Inspector General shall submit a notice that the information or assistance requested is being unreasonably refused or not provided by the head of the establishment involved or the head of the Federal agency involved, as applicable, to—

“(A) the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the establishment involved or the Federal agency involved, as applicable;

“(B) the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives; and

“(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.”.

#### **TITLE XI—ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING**

##### **SEC. 1101. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Inspector General Training Enhancement Act”.

##### **SEC. 1102. ENHANCEMENTS TO INSPECTOR GENERAL TRAINING.**

Section 11(c)(1)(E) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting “and establish minimum standards and best practices for training to ensure all Inspectors General receive training to carry out the duties, responsibilities, and authorities under this Act and on emerging areas of the law of relevance to Inspectors General and the work of their offices as identified by the Council” after “Inspector General”.

#### **TITLE XII—BUDGETARY EFFECTS**

##### **SEC. 1201. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, sub-

mitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

#### **TITLE XIII—SEVERABILITY**

##### **SEC. 1301. SEVERABILITY.**

If any provision of this Act (or the application of that provision to particular persons or circumstances) is held invalid or found to be unconstitutional the remainder of this Act (or the application of that provision to other persons or circumstances) shall not be affected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H.R. 2662.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to urge strong, bipartisan support for my bill, H.R. 2662, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act.

The work of inspectors general, who conduct independent oversight of Federal agencies, continues to be a remarkable investment for American taxpayers. For every dollar we spend on IGs, we get \$17 back. And this return could be even higher if we gave IGs additional tools, which is exactly what this bill would do.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act is a package of critical reforms to protect IGs from political retaliation and obstruction. I want to thank Leader HOYER for his support and work on this bill, as well as all the other cosponsors of the legislation.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act also has the support of 14 good government groups. They wrote that the reforms in this legislation “have been crafted to address problems with inspector general independence and authority long raised by Congress, civil society, and our inspectors general. We strongly urge Congress to pass this legislation to empower our independent watchdogs to serve the public even more effectively.”

This bill would enhance the independence of IGs in several ways. Most importantly, it would protect IGs from being fired simply for doing their jobs. The bill would only allow an IG to be removed for a documented cause, based on a defined list of nonpartisan reasons, such as a knowing violation of

the law, abuse of authority, or gross mismanagement.

These removal protections come from a bill I introduced last year, after the previous administration bullied, sidelined, and retaliated against multiple IGs.

Last April and May, in six short weeks, President Trump fired or sidelined four IGs and acting IGs who were simply doing their jobs.

On April 3, intelligence community IG Michael Atkinson was fired after he provided a whistleblower complaint to Congress about President Trump's now infamous call with Ukrainian President, part of the conduct for which he was impeached by this body.

On April 7, President Trump removed Glenn Fine as Acting Defense Department IG, which blocked IG Fine from serving as chair of the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee, a committee I helped create in the CARES Act to oversee trillions of dollars in Federal spending in response to the coronavirus pandemic. IG Fine was simply doing his job.

On May 15, President Trump removed Mitch Behm as the Acting Transportation Department IG and replaced him with an agency insider. Mr. Behm was investigating Secretary of Transportation Elaine Chao at the time.

And, finally, that same day, President Trump fired State Department IG Steve Linick, who, at the time, was investigating Secretary of State Mike Pompeo for abuse of power and misuse of resources, and replaced him with a political crony.

All four of these IGs were just following the law and the facts, yet they faced blatant retaliation. This is just plain wrong.

President Trump's actions struck at the heart of why we have IGs, to provide independent oversight and a check on executive branch waste, fraud, and abuse.

No President should be allowed to retaliate against an IG for simply doing their jobs, and the IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure that IGs are protected from this kind of retaliation.

In a letter to congressional leadership after the IG firings by Mr. Trump, nine former IGs wrote and said: "Forcing inspectors general to choose between doing their jobs with integrity and keeping their positions is not an acceptable model of governance and oversight. We therefore urge you to pass for-cause removal protections for all IGs."

In addition, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure temporary, acting IGs are independent and qualified by requiring the acting IG to be the deputy IG in the same office, or another senior official from the IG community if there is no deputy. This would protect against the appointment of acting IGs with conflicts of interest or who are acting as political appointees.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would further bolster IG

independence by requiring notification to Congress before an IG is pushed aside and placed on non-duty status so that we in Congress can support the independence of IGs.

The bill would also empower IGs by granting them the authority to subpoena nongovernment witnesses to provide testimony. In many investigations, testimony from nongovernment witnesses is essential. So providing IGs with this authority is often the only way to root out fraud or other wrongdoings.

In 2016, our former colleague, Mark Meadows, supported a similar provision and highlighted that bill's procedural safeguards, which are essentially the same in the bill we are considering today.

He stated: "This bill provides the expanded authority that the IGs have asked for, but with safeguards in place to make sure that they protect against the possibility that an IG's investigation would interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation, or do other harm."

□ 1645

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would also close a loophole that prevents the Department of Justice IG from initiating investigations into professional misconduct by DOJ attorneys.

This bill balances enhanced authorities and independence with new accountability and transparency measures for IGs.

For example, the bill contains the bipartisan Integrity Committee Transparency Act, which would require greater transparency from the CIGIE Integrity Committee, the body Congress set up to investigate IGs.

Supporting IG independence has long been a bipartisan issue. Congress must act now to protect and empower IGs so that they can perform the duties Congress has entrusted to them without being retaliated against.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the IG Independence and Empowerment Act and continue the bipartisan tradition of protecting and strengthening IGs.

To my Republican colleagues who may say these efforts are about attacking President Trump, I would respond with this: Joe Biden is the President now.

I am supporting good governments reforms under a Democratic administration because I believe in accountability no matter who the President is and what party they come from.

We are talking about the future. This is about safeguarding taxpayers' money and protecting the integrity of our government.

I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support these critical reforms as well.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, through their work, inspectors general help improve government efficiency and effectiveness. Their nonpartisan audits and investigations work to root out waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in all Federal agencies. In fact, the Committee on Oversight and Reform and IGs have this common mission, but IGs occupy a unique spot within the Federal Government. They have a responsibility to their respective agency and to Congress through the notice requirements.

When the political parties of the executive branch and Congress are different, political fights can understandably erupt. Unfortunately, this has recently led to a politicization of IG investigations.

That takes us to today's bill. Many provisions in this bill are a step in the right direction to empower IGs to conduct robust oversight. However, I remain concerned about some of the provisions in this bill.

Title I in this bill would unnecessarily constrain the President's ability to remove an IG, shifting the delicate balance between the executive branch and Congress. Maintaining the current balance would enable Congress to use its own oversight authority if it believes there is wrongdoing by the President or an agency head in the removal of an IG.

Next, in title III, the majority has proposed to dramatically limit who can be appointed as an acting inspector general if the IG has voluntarily left office or been removed. In doing so, this hinders the President's ability to appoint an IG with whom they have confidence.

While there are legitimate concerns about IGs serving at multiple agencies, this provision goes too far in limiting the President's authority over a subset of executive branch employees.

Finally, I have serious concerns with title V, the provision authorizing an inspector general to issue testimonial subpoena authorities to compel testimony from former Federal employees.

While it may be helpful for IGs to investigate certain allegations of misconduct, it also provides IGs with a tool that can be easily abused for political purposes. For example, this authority would enable new Biden-appointed inspectors general to subpoena former Trump administration officials under the guise of any investigation, regardless of the real purpose for the investigation.

Finally, this provision does not provide the necessary protections for former Federal employees who may be subjected to the legal fees of dealing with a subpoena, instead forcing them to pay for counsel to defend against and respond to these subpoenas. Without meaningful protections to ensure that testimonial subpoena authority would not be used to seek out political retribution, I cannot support this provision.

Rooting out waste, fraud, abuse, mismanagement, and misconduct is one of

the most important jobs of this committee, and inspectors general serve on the front lines with us in this mission. We must ensure that all of our inspectors general have the tools they need to conduct robust oversight of their respective agencies.

That is why committee Republicans offered multiple amendments at the markup to address these concerns but still empower our IGs. We again offered compromise amendments at the Rules Committee yesterday, but my Democrat colleagues have only allowed one of these amendments to be made in order.

I am hopeful that Democrats will take the opportunity to pass a major bipartisan bill by adopting this amendment. If they choose to continue down their partisan path, I hope my Democrat colleagues can stop the repeated attacks on the Trump administration.

Instead, we should focus on ensuring our inspectors general are focused on and equipped to conduct robust oversight over agency operations and spending.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House, an important leader on this legislation, and a steadfast leader on this and on so many issues before this body.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Chairwoman MALONEY's leadership on this issue and so many other issues to protect the citizens, protect consumers, protect voters, and protect, frankly, those who stand up and say there is wrongdoing.

I heard the remarks of the ranking member, and I appreciate his thoughtfulness. But as I was listening to him, I am thinking: How do you make sure that somebody is not cowed by a President, any President, who is prepared to take adverse action without cause against somebody because he or she does not like the investigation they are undertaking?

As the gentleman may know, and as my colleagues may know, I urged a rule that we adopted in this House which said that it is a violation of our rules to out a whistleblower. We have put whistleblower protections in, but unfortunately, when we had whistleblowers come forward most recently, they were attacked and attempted to be outed, which would have subjected them, obviously, to the adverse consequences against which we tried to protect them in the legislation that we passed on whistleblowing. So, I see some analogy between these two.

I thank Vice Chairman GOMEZ, Chairman CONNOLLY, Chairman LYNCH, and Representatives PORTER and LIEU for working on this legislation and supporting this legislation. I was proud to introduce it with the chair of the committee and proud to support it.

Madam Speaker, Americans deserve the highest standards of ethics, trans-

parency, and accountability from their government. Federal agencies and officials work for the people, and they must be accountable to the people. That is why the previous administration's assault on the independence of inspectors general was so alarming.

This is not an attack on a specific administration. As the gentlewoman and chair of the committee has pointed out, we have a Democratic President now, so this is going to bind him. It is not going to bind his predecessors. If anything, it is certainly not anti-Biden, but it is to say: President Biden, we respect you, but we want to have inspectors general who have the confidence they can move ahead without fear of retribution.

Former President Trump removed or replaced, as has been pointed out, the inspectors general from the Departments of Defense, State, Health and Human Services, and Transportation. What kind of a check and balance is that, if a President can simply say, "I don't like what you are doing. I am removing you"? I would suggest none, with all due respect to my friend.

These watchdogs must be able to act independently and be free from political pressure or threats to their careers. It seems to me that is a very commonsense, rational judgment to make. That is what this is about.

We introduced our bill to address the challenge exposed by the actions of the prior administration, that is true. But that has not been the only administration that has acted to undermine inspectors general.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation today. It will build on the provisions that I pushed to include in the House Rules Committee, as I pointed out in January, which protects Federal whistleblowers by making it a violation of House rules for Members to reveal their identities.

Those who come forward to reveal misconduct or violations of the public trust need to be heard and must be protected from threats of retaliation. If that is not the case, it will undermine the very objective that we seek in creating IGs. They need to know that they can go to inspectors general or to Congress under strong whistleblower protections.

House Democrats, and I hope House Republicans, will renew the faith in government and ensure that it works for the people. We are determined to protect and strengthen government accountability.

I hope all of us, in a bipartisan way, will repair this very critical principle of accountability for the people of this country.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ), the vice chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the IG Independence and Empowerment Act.

This comprehensive legislation would ensure inspectors general have the tools needed to conduct thorough investigations without fear of political retaliation.

Many of these reforms have had strong bipartisan support for years, in particular, my bill, the IG Subpoena Authority Act. This provision grants IGs the authority to subpoena testimony from former employees and contractors as a tool to better uncover waste, fraud, and abuse. Currently, the absence of such authority hinders the ability of OIGs to conduct complete oversight in matters of corruption and injustice.

I know my Republican colleagues claim this authority has no protections from abuse, but that simply is not true. This bill includes safeguards to ensure that this authority is not abused by requiring that an IG must have a subpoena approved by a panel of three other IGs.

Additionally, I understand my Republican colleague may introduce an amendment that would strike the subpoena authority provision from this bill today. I find this interesting and confusing because the IG Subpoena Authority Act was first introduced in the 115th Congress by Republican Congressman Steve Russell with the support of then-Chairman Towns and Ranking Member ISSA, and it passed the House by unanimous consent.

This bill has not changed substantially since the 115th Congress. What has changed is the political context in which we are trying to pass this reform. If a reform was good for government then, it is a reform that is good for government now. Nothing has changed.

Madam Speaker, we need to make sure that the IG Subpoena Authority Act is included and passed today. That will help strengthen the integrity and maintain the accountability in our Federal agencies.

I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for its inclusion in the IG Independence and Empowerment Act. It is a step forward for good government, and I strongly encourage an "aye" vote.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1700

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER), the vice chair of the Subcommittee on Government Operations of the Oversight Committee.

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act protects our Nation's government watchdogs.

Inspectors general are independent officials responsible for preventing and detecting waste, fraud, and abuse. They safeguard the interests of taxpayers and weed out corruption. We need stronger protections to prevent biased or unqualified acting inspectors general from assuming these vital roles.



I championed such measures in my Accountability for Acting Officials Act, and I am proud to say they are included in the chairwoman's bill. These provisions would forbid dual-hatting, serving as both a political appointee and an acting inspector general at the same agency. This conflict of interest compromises the independence of the inspector general's work.

American taxpayers fund these agencies. They deserve to know that those agencies are working on their behalf. They deserve inspectors general who will fight to protect their dollars and our government's integrity.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act.

I thank Chair MALONEY for her leadership on government integrity, including this important bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her amendment, her hard work on this bill, and her leadership on the subcommittee and committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Operations.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2662, the IG Independence and Empowerment Act. I want to thank the chairwoman of the committee for her leadership, especially in bringing forward this important legislative package to bolster the independence and protection of oversight of Federal inspectors general while holding them more accountable to Congress and the American people at the same time.

Our Subcommittee on Government Operations held a hearing in April that highlighted the need for this legislation. At the hearing, we discussed how the former President, Mr. Trump, exploited statutory loopholes repeatedly to attack Federal IGs, firing well-respected IGs for investigating policies of political allies he liked.

President Trump also appointed political agency officials to serve as acting IGs, this double-hatting Ms. PORTER just talked about. This legislation would address that. We cannot allow these actions to be repeated.

IGs are unique in the Federal Government, serving to root out waste, fraud, abuse, and gross mismanagement. They report both to the executive and legislative branches of government. This bill bolsters IGs on both fronts.

Importantly, the bill ensures the President or an agency head can remove an IG only for documented cause, and I think that is a very important new standard. This measure will ensure that IGs can be removed when appropriate and cannot be removed simply because they speak truth to power.

I authored two additional provisions included in this legislation. The first,

the Integrity Committee Transparency Act, is a bipartisan provision I drafted with my ranking member, Mr. HICE. This provision would codify and enhance administrative reporting reforms at the Integrity Committee. Just this week, we saw how important that can be.

It would also require the Integrity Committee to report immediately any particularly serious and flagrant problems, abuses, or deficiencies at the Office of Inspector General to the IG of that office.

Importantly, the provision also expands the membership of the Integrity Committee to include a former inspector general, increasing acumen and accountability and some distance.

These are critical measures necessary in the wake of cases in which the Integrity Committee has sometimes fallen short in its reporting to this body, to the Congress. In one recent allegation of wrongdoing, it took nearly 4 years for the Integrity Committee to complete its investigation, and employees at that office continued to struggle under an IG who conducted herself with clear negligence. That case got resolved today with the announcement that that IG is going to retire.

IGs cannot afford to be poor leaders, nor can we afford to have them be poor leaders. They must be model Federal employees if their credibility and integrity are to be trusted.

We also champion title VII of this bill, the Enhanced Whistleblower Engagement Act. This provision requires OIG employees to undergo whistleblower training, mandates engagement between a designated whistleblower coordinator and the Integrity Committee, and requires CIGIE to identify best practices for the timely and appropriate handling of alleged reprisals within an OIG.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman such time as he may consume.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, this measure is nearly identical to a bipartisan provision in the Senate crafted by Republican Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa.

In addition to these provisions, the bill includes several other important measures to bolster the independence of our nonpartisan watchdogs. This bill is an important bill in reasserting the independence, accountability, and transparency of IGs. They are a critical part of making this government work and rebuilding American trust in its government.

I thank the distinguished chairwoman for her leadership in bringing this bill before us. I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, first, I would

like to recognize the hard work of the chairman of the subcommittee. He authored two proposals that were included in the bill and was a major leader on it. I thank Mr. CONNOLLY.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Oversight Committee and a member of the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis of the Oversight Committee.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank Chair MALONEY for her wonderful leadership of the Oversight Committee.

I rise in support of H.R. 2662, the Inspector General Independence and Empowerment Act.

The inspectors general are a remarkable innovation in American Government that have saved us untold billions of dollars and checked the corrupt abuse of power by people controlling Federal departments. They are essential to our ability to legislate as the Article I branch and to do meaningful oversight over the executive branch of government.

That is true in general, but it is especially true when we have a President like Donald Trump who categorically refused to recognize congressional subpoenas, blocked members of his administration from coming to testify before Congress in an unprecedented way, and generally refused to cooperate with congressional factfinding at all.

When a President refuses to cooperate with the legislative branch, when he obstructs Congress at every turn, the IGs are our only source of information. It is imperative that we protect our inspectors general's independence and their impartiality so they will not be reduced to the level of being Presidential sycophants who are party loyalists.

The Supreme Court has recognized the importance of IG independence, noting that it is "vital to effectuating Congress' intent and maintaining an opportunity for objective inquiries into bureaucratic waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement."

This bill will ensure that the IGs have the tools that they need to conduct thorough investigations on behalf of the American people, and it will protect them from unjust political retaliation.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am excited to listen to the enthusiasm from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and their newfound passion for oversight. The Republicans on the Oversight Committee have been asking for many hearings on many different areas of potential oversight, potential waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the Federal Government. But thus far, in this new Congress, my friends on the other side of the aisle have only been interested in oversight of the previous administration.

I am getting really excited for the taxpayers of America because I feel like, today, I am hearing that my friends on the other side of the aisle are interested in ensuring that there is good government, that we have transparency.

One thing that I would like to mention in this bill is that the Oversight Committee is responsible for oversight, and we want to work with the inspectors general. We have a lot of agreement in this bill, and I will talk about that during my closing remarks. But I do believe there is the potential for us to compromise and have a bipartisan bill that actually might have a chance to become law down the hall.

But I hope that this newfound enthusiasm for oversight will carry over, and we can do what the Oversight Committee is supposed to do and not rely as heavily on unelected bureaucrats.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, my dear friend and colleague, for having great enthusiasm for oversight and combating waste, fraud, and abuse. I would respectfully offer to him that the best way to conduct that is to give the power to the IGs to conduct legitimate investigations. What we have seen is that when there comes a legitimate investigation, they are often moved aside, fired, or retaliated against.

So, I welcome the gentleman's enthusiasm. I hope he will join with me in supporting giving the power to IGs to conduct legitimate investigations of waste, fraud, and abuse.

As I said in my opening remarks, for every dollar we spend on IGs, we get back \$17, really hundreds of millions of dollars back from their oversight and work.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind the gentleman, as he knows from our hearings, there are many provisions in this bill that are bipartisan, several that Mr. CONNOLLY just mentioned that we were working on. I look forward to working with him and passing this bill.

It should be bipartisan. Oversight and accountability should be bipartisan. I hope the gentleman joins us in voting for this important bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER), the chair of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel of the Armed Services Committee. She also serves on the Oversight and Reform Committee and is the co-chair of the Democratic Women's Caucus.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, the history of whistleblowing dates back to the founding of this country. The Continental Congress was committed to making sure that whistleblowers would have a voice. Last year alone, \$2.2 billion was saved by the taxpayers because of whistleblowers in our government.

The April massacre of IGs was an unprecedented power play by the President, a ruthless President who somehow thought they worked for him. They don't work for him. They didn't work for him. They work for the American people, and that is why, since the founding of this country, we have been so committed to it.

Today's legislation will protect IGs from retaliation and increase their independence, ensuring they operate free from political interference. Those complaints that those IGs were looking at were brought to them by individuals. It was a political move by the President to fire them.

I am interested that my colleague on the other side of the aisle was concerned about the costs of being represented by counsel when someone who is a Federal employee is called in to testify. Maybe we can work on a bill to make sure that every Federal employee has that benefit. No one talked about that when Ambassador Yovanovitch was called in to testify or National Security Advisor Fiona Hill or Lieutenant Colonel Vindman, all of whom had to pick up the tab for the attorneys representing them.

Last month during a hearing before the Oversight Subcommittee on Government Operations, the current Chair of the Council of the Inspectors General, Inspector General Allison Lerner, testified that while they offer multiple trainings for IGs, the trainings are not mandated.

I believe, without mandated training, it is impossible to ensure that IGs are operating at the highest level and are well-equipped to carry out their duties, so I am pleased that my amendment requiring minimum standards and best practices for training IGs has been included in this bill.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 23½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, JACKIE SPEIER, for her tremendous work on this bill, and one of the major provisions was a bill of hers that was incorporated into it.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), a newly elected Member from the great State of North Carolina and a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise today in support of the Inspector General Independence Act. Inspectors general are vital to the integrity, efficiency, and efficacy of our Government. It is crucial that they operate free from political influence.

This critical legislation includes a bipartisan bill I introduced, the Inspec-

tor General Access Act, which grants the inspector general of the Department of Justice the authority to investigate misconduct by DOJ attorneys.

The DOJ inspector general is currently the only Federal inspector general without this authority. This is simply unacceptable.

DOJ attorneys wield a tremendous amount of power, including the ability to make life and death decisions. It is crucial that these attorneys are held to the highest level of professionalism, and that their actions and conduct are subject to independent oversight.

For this reason, I wholeheartedly support the Inspector General Independence Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just a couple of things I want to make sure that everyone understands with respect to this bill. This bill is a combination of 10 different bills. Republicans support seven of the 10 bills. Seven of the 10 bills we could pass pretty close to unanimously in this Chamber that would strengthen the IGs and not hamper a President's ability to terminate an IG that may not agree with their ideology.

No one in Congress would hire a staffer that adamantly opposed their ideology. No one in the private sector would have a staffer be a spokesperson or an employee that fundamentally disagreed with the direction that person wanted to lead their company. And the same should be true with the President of the United States.

With respect to President Trump's termination of inspectors general, I want to mention a couple of terminations that the President did. President Trump removed the Intelligence Community Inspector General Michael Atkinson because he flaunted strict whistleblower procedures to provide the Ukraine whistleblower report to Chairman SCHIFF.

Now, we support good government. We want to protect whistleblowers. We want to encourage whistleblowers to come forward. ADAM SCHIFF did more to damage prospective whistleblowers than any Member of this body. And the IG was complicit with him in that. That was a rightful termination by President Trump.

Acting Inspector General Christi Grimm purposely released an outdated and misleading report claiming there were shortages of medical equipment at hospitals which was found to be entirely inaccurate and likely was politically motivated. That is why President Trump terminated her.

So there are examples of a President rightfully terminating an inspector general, and I don't think that this bill is the right path to move forward. This is overlegislating.

We are passing a lot of bills out of this Chamber that are dead upon arrival in the Senate. When we pass a bill that has bipartisan support, that makes a difference in the Senate. We



could achieve that, and I have an amendment that goes a long way towards making this bill bipartisan.

So with respect to oversight, I think the American people are upset over COVID-19. Speaker PELOSI created a Select Committee on the Coronavirus Crisis, which is a subsidiary of the House Oversight Committee, we share the same staff. We have been asking for hearings on the origins of COVID-19 and had no response, no luck from my friends across the aisle, so we had a hearing today. We had a forum. And it was very productive. And I think the people of America appreciated that. That is oversight.

So our committee can go a lot further with respect to oversight, and I think that we could come to a bipartisan compromise to strengthen the IGs without politicizing the IGs, without hampering a President's ability to get rid of a bad IG.

I strongly oppose this bill. I hope through the amendment process it can get better, that it can pass in a bipartisan manner, and we can strengthen the IGs, and we can send a message to the Senate that we have a bipartisan bill that you should take up and President Biden can hopefully sign into law.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Independence is the bedrock principle of inspectors general, and this legislation would protect and enhance their critical work.

As I mentioned earlier, this legislation has the support of several non-partisan, good government groups, including the Project on Government Oversight, the Government Accountability Project, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and many, many others. It also contains several bipartisan bills that are part of the overall inspector general reform bill. I ask that the support letters from the good government groups be included in the RECORD.

JUNE 28, 2021.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The undersigned organizations write to express our support for the IG Independence and Empowerment Act (H.R. 2662) and to urge you to vote for this critical legislation.

Our federal inspectors general (IGs) identify and investigate waste, fraud, and abuse within the executive branch. The importance of their work cannot be overstated. Executive branch officials and Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle rely on oversight conducted by inspectors general to inform their policy-making. These watchdogs continually return substantial savings for taxpayers. In fiscal year 2020 alone, inspectors general identified potential savings of approximately \$53 billion. And perhaps most importantly, inspectors general investigate and expose abuses of power that may infringe on constitutional rights.

If enacted, this legislation would address critical weaknesses in laws that have limited the effectiveness and threatened the independence of these watchdogs.

For example, most inspectors general lack the authority to compel former agency officials, subcontractors, or subgrantees to co-

operate with IG investigations. This has limited the ability of our watchdogs to effectively review federal programs for waste and fraud and to investigate federal employees accused of misconduct. The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would address this by giving inspectors general the authority to compel testimony from former agency officials, subcontractors, or grantees where that testimony would be relevant to ongoing investigations.

Another weakness is that the president can fire these watchdogs and replace them with unqualified or conflicted individuals, exposing the work of these offices to unnecessary political interference. The public and Congress depend on inspectors general to ensure our federal agencies are functioning effectively, but these watchdogs must be confident they will not be fired for doing that job well. As nine former inspectors general recently wrote to Congress, "Forcing inspectors general to choose between doing their jobs with integrity and keeping their positions is not an acceptable model of governance and oversight." The IG Independence and Empowerment Act places reasonable limits on when a president can remove an inspector general and who can serve in the event of a vacancy, and will further insulate the critical oversight offices from politics.

There are many other critical reforms in this comprehensive legislation that have been crafted to address problems with inspector general independence and authority long raised by Congress, civil society, and our inspectors general. We strongly urge Congress to pass this legislation to empower our independent watchdogs to serve the public even more effectively.

Sincerely,

Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW), Common Cause, Demand Progress, Government Accountability Project, Government Information Watch, Mainers for Accountable Leadership, National Security Counselors, Open The Government, Project On Government Oversight (POGO), Protect Democracy, Public Citizen, Stand Up America, Taxpayers for Common Sense, The Digital Democracy Project.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. The reforms we are considering today are only one part of the work Congress needs to prevent future Presidents from abusing power. I also strongly support the broad Protecting Our Democracy Act, which Chairman SCHIFF has spearheaded, and I look forward to that bill's consideration very soon.

I do want to say that the Select Committee on the Coronavirus Crisis, unlike the description from my good friend and colleague, has held 15 hearings of oversight. They have disclosed and recovered millions of dollars of illegal spending or corrupt spending. There is a hearing tomorrow, which will be the 16th hearing of the committee, and we welcome you to join us at that subcommittee hearing if you so wish.

The inspector general community just, in general, has been attacked in recent years. By passing this IG Independence and Empowerment Act, Congress would send a strong message in the strongest terms that no administration, regardless of President or party, can bully or retaliate or act against an IG when the IG is doing

their job. They can only be removed for just cause, such as violating the law or gross mismanagement.

In passing this legislation, we will be strengthening our democracy, and we will send a strong message that Congress supports accountability and an effective government.

I urge all my colleagues to vote "yes" on this bill. It should be a bipartisan bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part A of House Report 117-74 not earlier considered as part of amendments en bloc pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504, shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part A of House Report 117-74, not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Reform or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MRS.

CAROLYN B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 504, I offer amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 printed in part A of House Report 117-74, offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MRS. AXNE OF IOWA

Page 6, after line 16, add the following new section (and amend the table of contents accordingly):

#### SEC. 103. REMOVAL OR TRANSFER REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 102, is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "reasons" and inserting "substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,"; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates

to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (1), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

“(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and  
“(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.”.

(b) REASONS FOR REMOVAL OR TRANSFER FOR DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITIES.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “reasons” and inserting “substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons,”; and

(2) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) If there is an open or completed inquiry into an Inspector General that relates to the removal or transfer of the Inspector General under paragraph (2), the written communication required under that paragraph shall—

“(A) identify each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, the inquiry; and

“(B) in the case of a completed inquiry, contain the findings made during the inquiry.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. BOURDEAU  
OF GEORGIA

Page 34, line 1, strike “and” and insert “,”.

Page 34, line 3, insert “,” and on the use of and process for the suspension or debarment of persons for eligibility for Federal contracts” after “Council”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CARTER OF  
LOUISIANA

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly):

**TITLE XII—EQUITABLE PAY FOR  
INSPECTORS GENERAL**

**SEC. 1201. EQUITABLE PAY FOR INSPECTORS  
GENERAL.**

Section 3(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after “3 percent” the following: “or the rate of pay that is equal to the highest rate of basic pay of any other employee of the Office of such Inspector General, whichever is higher”.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. MALINOWSKI  
OF NEW JERSEY

Page 7, line 4, strike “OFFICES” and insert “OFFICE”.

Page 7, line 13, strike “ENTITIES” and insert “ENTITY”.

Page 7, after line 21, insert the following:

(c) EXCEPTION TO REQUIREMENT TO SUBMIT COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CERTAIN CHANGES IN STATUS.—

(1) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF OFFICE.—Section 3(b) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 102(1), is further amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “If” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), if”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the President may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

“(A) the President determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

“(B) in the communication, the President includes—

“(i) a specification of which clause the President relied on to make the determination under subparagraph (A);

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

“(4) The President may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the President—

“(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the President relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the President relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.”.

(2) COMMUNICATION RELATING TO CHANGE IN STATUS OF INSPECTOR GENERAL OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL ENTITY.—Section 8G(e) of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “If” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (3), if”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) If an Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, the head of a designated Federal entity may submit the communication described in paragraph (1) to Congress later than 30 days before the Inspector General is placed on paid or unpaid non-duty status, but in any case not later than the date on which the placement takes effect, if—

“(A) the head determines that a delay in placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property;

“(B) in the communication, the head includes—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.

“(4) The head may not place an Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status during the 30-day period preceding the date on which the Inspector General is removed or transferred under paragraph (1) unless the head—

“(A) determines that not placing the Inspector General on paid or unpaid non-duty status would—

“(i) pose a threat to the Inspector General or others;

“(ii) result in the destruction of evidence relevant to an investigation; or

“(iii) result in loss of or damage to Government property; and

“(B) on or before the date on which the placement takes effect, submits to the Committee in the House of Representatives and the Committee in the Senate that has jurisdiction over the Inspector General involved, the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, a written communication that contains the following information—

“(i) a specification of which clause under subparagraph (A) the head relied on to make the determination under such subparagraph;

“(ii) the substantive rationale, including detailed and case-specific reasons, for such determination;

“(iii) if the head relied on an inquiry to make such determination, an identification of each entity that is conducting, or that conducted, such inquiry; and

“(iv) if an inquiry described in clause (iii) is completed, the findings of that inquiry.”.

Page 7, strike line 22 and all that follows through line 24 and insert the following:

(d) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to removals, transfers, and changes of status occurring on or after the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Page 29, line 20, strike “ESTABLISHMENT” and insert “OFFICE”.

Page 30, line 10, strike “is” and insert “, as amended by section 202(c)(2), is further”.

Page 30, line 12, strike “(3)” and insert “(5)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. TORRES OF  
NEW YORK

Page 34, after line 3, insert the following (and amend the table of contents and redesignate the subsequent titles accordingly):

**TITLE XII—REPORT**

**SEC. 1201. GAO REVIEW AND REPORT.**

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall—

(1) conduct a review that evaluates the effectiveness of the processes of the Integrity Committee of the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and the processes of Offices of Inspector General, respectively, for ensuring that Inspectors General—

(A) are held accountable through the investigation of allegations of wrongdoing, including allegations of misconduct, abuse of authority, or other malfeasance, that are made against such Inspectors General; and

(B) meet relevant standards for integrity and independence;

(2) identify recommendations with respect to—

(A) enhancing accountability for Inspectors General; and

(B) ensuring that Inspectors General meet relevant standards for integrity and independence; and

(3) issue a report—

(A) on the results of the review required by paragraph (1); and

(B) that contains any recommendations identified under paragraph (2).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, the amendment offered by Congresswoman CINDY AXNE would increase transparency when an inspector general is removed.

This amendment would require the President or independent agency head to provide Congress a detailed case-specific explanation when firing an IG.

The amendment would also require the President or independent agency head to provide to Congress the findings from an inquiry that led to the IG's removal.

These requirements would enhance IG independence in addition to the critical for-cause removal protections already in the bill.

The amendment offered by Congresswoman CAROLYN BOURDEAUX would enhance training requirements for inspectors general.

This amendment would ensure that IGs are trained in an important aspect of their oversight work over Federal contractors.

The suspension and debarment process provides an essential tool to hold Federal contractors accountable for waste, fraud, and abuse.

Federal procurement law and the suspension and debarment processes are highly complex, and it is important that all IGs are well-versed on these issues.

This training will help make IGs even more effective and efficient and could lead to more taxpayer savings.

The amendment offered by Congressman TROY CARTER would ensure IGs are paid at an equitable level with senior staff in their office.

Through an unintended consequence in current law, IGs are sometimes paid less than the senior staff in their own offices. This inequity could lead to difficulty in attracting the most qualified people to be IGs.

This amendment would add language to current law providing that IGs have to be paid at least the same rate of pay as the highest paid employee in the IG's office.

This simple change would help ensure that IGs are paid what they deserve for the critical work they perform.

□ 1730

The amendment offered by Congressman TOM MALINOWSKI would balance notification to Congress with the need to address an immediate threat.

The base bill would require that the President or an independent agency head would notify Congress at least 30 days before placing an IG on non-duty status.

This amendment would make an exception to that requirement if any delay in that placement would mean a threat to people, property, or an ongoing investigation.

This amendment would give the President or agency head flexibility in the case of a documented threat, while ensuring Congress is notified of any change to an IG status in advance whenever possible.

And, finally, an amendment offered by Congressman RITCHIE TORRES, which would provide a needed review of all processes to ensure IGs are held accountable.

This amendment would require the Government Accountability Office to review existing processes for investigating allegations of IG wrongdoing, including the processes of the CIGIE Integrity Committee. The results of this review would provide Congress with critical information to know how well these processes are working and how to improve them, if needed.

IGs provide a critical check on waste, fraud, and abuse in the government, and their own conduct must be above reproach.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to adopt this commonsense package of amendments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendments en bloc.

Madam Speaker, some of the amendments in the proposed package attempt to be helpful and improve the bill, but most are just Band-Aids attempting to cover up flawed provisions.

For example, one amendment attempts to paper over the flaws in title I by expanding the requirement for the President to provide his or her rationale to Congress detailing why an IG was removed.

Yes, understanding the President's rationale for removing an IG is very important to Congress. This amendment, however, fails to address the fundamental issue in the section, specifically limiting the reasons for an IG's removal or transferred to only nine constraining reasons.

Another provision in this package seeks to amend title II, but title II already passed earlier this Congress as a standalone bill by voice vote under suspension. This amendment to title II would undermine that broadly supported bill by creating an easy-to-abuse loophole for a President to remove an IG immediately, rather than waiting the 30 days for Congress to review the required notice of removal.

My Democrat colleagues have stated constantly that the goal of their legislation is to ensure that it is incredibly difficult to remove an IG, yet they support an amendment that would gut this and allow our President to circumvent the will of Congress. This is what hap-

pens when the majority decides to go it alone rather than seeking to work together to craft strong bipartisan legislation.

This bloc of amendments is the perfect analog for this legislation—many good provisions mixed with a few poison bills, which undermine the intent of the legislation as a whole. Therefore, I must ask my colleagues to vote against this package of amendments.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER), one of the newest members of our caucus. He serves on the Committees of Transportation and Infrastructure and Small Business.

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for her incredible leadership on this very critical and important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because I support this bill and the commonsense amendment that I have for it. I thank the chairwoman for her incredible hard work on this important issue.

Inspectors general play a key role in our government. They provide transparency and accountability into government programs and spending. They help prevent waste and fix mismanagement and abuse.

The IG Independence and Empowerment Act would ensure that they have the autonomy and the authority to do their jobs without political interference. My amendment is simple and in line with the goals of the bill. It would ensure that the inspector general is paid commensurate to their task.

Currently, IGs make less money than some of their senior advisers. I think the person with the most responsibility should be paid accordingly. If we want the best people to work these important jobs, we need to make sure that their pay matches their role. My amendment would fix an unintended consequence of current law and strengthen IG offices so that they can better carry out their essential work.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I support all of the en bloc amendments, including Mr. CARTER's, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The question is on the amendments en bloc.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part A of House Report 117-74.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 6, line 16.

Page 9, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 10, line 10.

Page 22, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 27, line 14.

Redesignate and renumber the remaining titles and sections and amend the table of contents accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, this amendment strips out the three provisions of this legislation that do not have bipartisan support in order for the IG Independence and Empowerment Act to move forward with the full support of the U.S. House. Both sides of the aisle can then come back to the table to fix the remaining provisions in a manner that addresses concerns on both sides of the aisle.

Specifically, my amendment strikes title I, which would artificially constrain the President from removing or reassigning an IG to one of nine specific reasons listed in the provision.

As drafted, title I would have the effect of prohibiting a President from removing an IG who is acting in bad faith and undermining a duly elected President's policies in a purely partisan manner.

My amendment also strikes title III, which strictly limits who the President could name as the acting inspector general to the "first assistant." This provision does not include any commonsense exceptions, creating unintended consequences.

For example, it could elevate an individual to acting IG who may be engaged in the same misconduct which caused the original IG to have been removed.

Lastly, my amendment strikes title V of the bill, which grants inspectors general the authority to issue subpoenas to compel the testimony of former Federal officials, including political appointees.

While I support granting IGs testimonial subpoena authority, the current provision lacks necessary safeguards and could result in it being used in a politically abusive manner.

Madam Speaker, I support the goals behind these provisions, as well as the other seven titles of the bill, which

have strong bipartisan support. However, my amendment addresses the problematic language in these three sections. That is why I ask my Republican and Democrat colleagues to pass this amendment to enable us to negotiate a bipartisan solution for the inspector general community that can be signed into law.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this amendment would absolutely gut the bill. The amendment would strike the bill's key protection for inspectors general against political retaliation by eliminating the protection that would only allow an IG to be removed only for a legitimate cause. Not for political retaliation, not because a President doesn't like what they are doing or an investigation that they have started, but only for mismanagement or illegal acts for cause.

We saw last year how unlimited authority can be abused when President Trump bullied and retaliated against two IGs who were investigating his administration, including when he fired the State Department IG. These protections are constitutional.

Last month, the Independent Congressional Review Service released an analysis of congressional authority to limit the removal of IGs and concluded that for-cause removal restrictions "appear to be a constitutionally permissible means of encouraging independence for most IGs."

Madam Speaker, this amendment would also gut the protection in the bill against the appointment of acting IGs with a clear conflict of interest. The amendment would strike a requirement that acting IGs come from an Office of Inspector General. The Council of Inspectors General for Integrity and Efficiency requested this reform, proposed by Republican Representative PORTER, as one of its top legislative priorities in order to "enhance the independence of OIGs."

We saw serious abuses during the last administration. In both the Department of Transportation and the Department of State, President Trump named political appointees within the agency to serve as the acting IG overseeing the same agency.

Finally, this amendment would strip from the bill an important reform that would allow IGs to issue a subpoena to require individuals outside of the Federal Government to provide testimony, if needed, for an investigation. This has long been a priority for inspectors general to allow thorough and complete investigations.

Madam Speaker, multiple IGs have reported that Trump administration officials, including Jeff Sessions, have

refused to cooperate with investigations. No Federal employee should be able to simply avoid and escape accountability by leaving government and saying, "I just no longer will testify or participate in finding the truth."

These provisions were passed by the Committee on Oversight and Reform and the House in 2018, in a Republican-led bill, and contained carefully crafted compromises struck by Chairman ISSA and Ranking Member Cummings years ago.

Madam Speaker, this legislation provides procedural safeguards to ensure that subpoena authority is not abused and it does not interfere with ongoing investigations. For example, the bill will require an inspector general to obtain the approval of a panel of three other inspectors general in order to issue a subpoena for testimony.

A few IGs, including the Department of Defense IG, already have this authority. The language I authored and that the Congress passed on a bipartisan basis, the Pandemic Response Accountability Committee was provided testimonial subpoena authority when it was created as part of the CARES Act last Congress.

There are many instances of former officials and nongovernment employees avoiding IG interviews going back over a decade. For example, IGs were unable to interview retired agents in the "Fast and Furious" investigation, and nongovernment witnesses to the Carter-Page FISA warrant investigation.

This has never been a partisan issue before. In fact, the underlying bill had many, many bipartisan pieces. So in a letter to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, Department of Justice Inspector General has also come out against this.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appear to have it.

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

□ 1745

Amendments En Bloc Offered by Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on the adoption of amendments en bloc, printed in part A of House Report 117-74, on

which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendments en bloc.

The Clerk redesignated the amendments en bloc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 184, not voting 27, as follows:

## [Roll No. 193]

## YEAS—219

Adams	Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez
Aguilar	Gonzalez,	Omar
Allred	Vicente	Pallone
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Panetta
Axne	Green, Al (TX)	Pappas
Barragán	Grijalva	Pascarell
Bass	Harder (CA)	Payne
Beatty	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bera	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Beyer	Himes	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Horsford	Pingree
Blumenauer	Houlihan	Pocan
Blunt Rochester	Hoyer	Porter
Bonamici	Huffman	Pressley
Bourdeaux	Jackson Lee	Price (NC)
Bowman	Jacobs (CA)	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Jayapal	Raskin
F.	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Brown	Johnson (GA)	Ross
Brownley	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Bush	Jones	Ruiz
Bustos	Kahele	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kaptur	Rush
Carbajal	Keating	Ryan
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Carson	Khanna	Sarbanes
Carter (LA)	Kildee	Scanlon
Cartwright	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Case	Kim (NJ)	Schiff
Casten	Kind	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Kinzinger	Schrader
Castro (TX)	Kirkpatrick	Schrier
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Cicilline	Kuster	Scott, David
Clark (MA)	Lamb	Sowell
Clarke (NY)	Langevin	Sherman
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Sires
Cohen	Lawrence	Slotkin
Connolly	Lawson (FL)	Smith (WA)
Cooper	Lee (CA)	Soto
Correa	Lee (NV)	Spanberger
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Speier
Courtney	Levin (CA)	Stansbury
Craig	Levin (MI)	Stanton
Crow	Lieu	Stevens
Cuellar	Lofgren	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lowenthal	Suzoi
Davis, Danny K.	Luria	Swalwell
Dean	Lynch	Takano
DeFazio	Malinowski	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Maloney,	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Carolyn B.	Titus
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Tlaib
Delgado	Manning	Tonko
Demings	Matsui	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	McBath	Torres (NY)
Deutch	McCollum	Trahan
Dingell	McEachin	Trone
Doggett	McGovern	Underwood
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Vargas
F.	Meng	Veasey
Escobar	Mfume	Vela
Eshoo	Moore (WI)	Velázquez
Espallat	Morelle	Wasserman
Evans	Moulton	Schultz
Fitzpatrick	Mrvan	Waters
Fletcher	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Foster	Nadler	Welch
Frankel, Lois	Napolitano	Wexton
Galleo	Neal	Wild
Garamendi	Neguse	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Newman	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Yarmuth
Golden	O'Halleran	

## NAYS—184

Aderholt	Gimenez	Mooney
Allen	Gonzales, Tony	Moore (UT)
Amodei	Gonzalez (OH)	Mullin
Armstrong	Gooden (TX)	Murphy (NC)
Babin	Gosar	Nehls
Bacon	Granger	Newhouse
Baird	Graves (LA)	Nunes
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Obernolte
Barr	Green (TN)	Owens
Bentz	Greene (GA)	Palazzo
Bergman	Griffith	Palmer
Bice (OK)	Grothman	Pence
Biggs	Guthrie	Perry
Bilirakis	Hagedorn	Posey
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Reed
Boebert	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Bost	Hartzler	Rice (SC)
Brady	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Brooks	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hill	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hinson	Rosendale
Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Budd	Hudson	Rutherford
Burchett	Huizenga	Salazar
Burgess	Jacobs (NY)	Scalise
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Cammack	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Carl	Jordan	Sessions
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Simpson
Cawthorn	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Chabot	Katko	Smith (NE)
Cheney	Keller	Smith (NJ)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Spartz
Cole	Kim (CA)	Staubert
Comer	Kustoff	Steel
Crawford	LaHood	Stefanik
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Steil
Curtis	Lamborn	Steube
Davidson	Latta	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	LaTurner	Taylor
DesJarlais	Lesko	Tenney
Diaz-Balart	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	Loudermilk	Timmons
Duncan	Lucas	Turner
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Upton
Emmer	Mace	Valadao
Estes	Malliotakis	Van Drew
Fallon	Mann	Van Dуйne
Feenstra	Massie	Wagner
Ferguson	Mast	Walberg
Fischbach	McCarthy	Walorski
Fitzgerald	McCauley	Waltz
Fleischmann	McClain	Webster (FL)
Fortenberry	McClintock	Wenstrup
Fox	McHenry	Westerman
Franklin, C.	McKinley	Wilson (SC)
Scott	Meijer	Wittman
Gaetz	Meuser	Womack
Garbarino	Miller (WV)	Young
Garcia (CA)	Miller-Meeks	Zeldin
Gibbs	Moolenaar	

## NOT VOTING—27

Arrington	Guest	Miller (IL)
Banks	Herrell	Moore (AL)
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Norman
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Pfuger
Crist	Issa	Rose
Fulcher	Jackson	Roy
Gallagher	Johnson (LA)	Tiffany
Gohmert	Long	Weber (TX)
Good (VA)	Meeks	Williams (TX)

## □ 1814

Messrs. FEENSTRA, COLE, and SMITH of New Jersey changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the en bloc amendments were agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Clark (MA)	Garcia (IL)
Bourdeaux	(Kuster)	(Gomez)
(Kuster)	Cohen (Beyer)	Garcia (TX)
Cárdenas	DesJarlais	(Jeffries)
(Gomez)	(Fleischmann)	Gonzalez,
Carl (Joyce (PA))	Fallon (Nehls)	Vincente
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Galleo (Gomez)	(Carbajal)

Grijalva	Leger Fernandez	Rush
(Stanton)	(Jacobs (CA))	(Underwood)
Horsford	Lieu (Beyer)	Sewell (DelBene)
(Jeffries)	Lowenthal	Steube
Hoyer (Trone)	(Beyer)	(Franklin, C.
Jackson Lee	McClain	Scott)
(Butterfield)	(Bergman)	Strickland
Jacobs (NY)	Meng (Jeffries)	(DelBene)
(Garbarino)	Mullin (Lucas)	Timmons
Johnson (TX)	Napolitano	(Wilson (SC))
(Jeffries)	(Correa)	Torres (NY)
Kind (Connolly)	Owens (Curtis)	(Jeffries)
Kirkpatrick	Payne (Pallone)	Wilson (FL)
(Stanton)	Rice (NY)	(Hayes)
Lawson (FL)	(Peters)	Young (Joyce
(Evans)	Ruiz (Aguilar)	(OH))

(By unanimous consent, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF VICTIMS OF THE CHAMPLAIN TOWERS COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a grieving but hopeful heart in the wake of an unimaginable tragedy in Surfside, Florida.

As we gather, our world-renowned Miami Dade search and rescue teams are joined by teams from as far away as Israel and Mexico to search for potential survivors of Champlain Towers South in Surfside.

Since that unprecedented collapse, first responders, medical personnel, engineers, grief counselors, and case-workers have painstakingly worked nonstop to assist in the search and rescue, providing support to the families and to begin an investigation.

For those still trapped, we hold out hope for the search to discover survivors. For all those who lost loved ones, we send our deepest condolences and pledge support and solidarity.

So many in our community fled nations where they faced danger. That makes this tragedy all the more painful. But we are resilient. We will be there every step of the way for the families of those missing in the rubble. But we know we cannot do this alone.

I thank the Biden administration for the speedy delivery of Federal resources, and Mayors Daniella Levine Cava and Charles Burkett for their steadfast leadership in this truly unprecedented crisis.

And our deepest thanks for the remarkable, relentless first responders who are still on that pile, searching around the clock in the hope of finding even one survivor.

Madam Speaker, the agony that these families are going through is beyond comprehension. So on behalf of the missing, those who perished, and their families, I ask that the House please rise and pause for a moment of silence in memory and in honor of those who have been struggling through this Surfside tragedy and crisis.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would ask all Members to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of the victims of the collapse of the Champlain Towers building in Surfside, Florida.

## AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. COMER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is

the question on amendment No. 4, printed in part A of House Report 117-74, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 182, nays 220, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

YEAS—182

Aderholt	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Allen	Gonzalez (OH)	Moore (UT)
Amodel	Gooden (TX)	Mullin
Armstrong	Gosar	Murphy (NC)
Babin	Granger	Nehls
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Newhouse
Baird	Green (TN)	Nunes
Balderson	Greene (GA)	Obernolte
Barr	Griffith	Owens
Bentz	Grothman	Palazzo
Bergman	Guthrie	Palmer
Bice (OK)	Hagedorn	Pence
Biggs	Harris	Perry
Bilirakis	Harshbarger	Posey
Bishop (NC)	Hartzler	Reed
Boebert	Hern	Reschenthaler
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Brady	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Brooks	Hinson	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Hudson	Rosendale
Budd	Huizenga	Rouzer
Burchett	Jacobs (NY)	Rutherford
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Salazar
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cammack	Jordan	Schweikert
Carl	Joyce (OH)	Scott, Austin
Cawthorn	Joyce (PA)	Sessions
Chabot	Katko	Simpson
Cheney	Keller	Smith (MO)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Clyde	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Kim (CA)	Smucker
Cole	Kinzinger	Spartz
Comer	Kustoff	Stauber
Crawford	LaHood	Steel
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Curtis	Lamborn	Steil
Davidson	Latta	Steube
Davis, Rodney	LaTurner	Stewart
DesJarlais	Lesko	Taylor
Diaz-Balart	Letlow	Tenney
Donalds	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Duncan	Lucas	Timmons
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Emmer	Mace	Upton
Estes	Malliotakis	Valadao
Fallon	Mann	Van Drew
Feenstra	Massie	Van Dyne
Ferguson	Mast	Wagner
Fischbach	McCarthy	Walberg
Fitzgerald	McCaul	Walorski
Fleischmann	McClain	Waltz
Fortenberry	McClintock	Webster (FL)
Foxx	McHenry	Wenstrup
Franklin, C.	McKinley	Westerman
Scott	Meijer	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Meuser	Wittman
Garcia (CA)	Miller (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Miller-Meeks	Young
Gimenez	Moolenaar	Zeldin

NAYS—220

Adams	Bourdeaux	Case
Aguilar	Bowman	Casten
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Castor (FL)
Auchincloss	F.	Castro (TX)
Axne	Brown	Chu
Barragán	Brownley	Cicilline
Bass	Bush	Clark (MA)
Beatty	Bustos	Clarke (NY)
Bera	Butterfield	Cleaver
Beyer	Carbajal	Clyburn
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cohen
Blumenauer	Carson	Connolly
Blunt Rochester	Carter (LA)	Cooper
Bonamici	Cartwright	Correa

Costa	Kilmer	Pressley
Courtney	Kim (NJ)	Price (NC)
Craig	Kind	Quigley
Crist	Kirkpatrick	Raskin
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Kuster	Ross
Davids (KS)	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Ruiz
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeGette	Lawrence	Ryan
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DelBene	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Demings	Leger Fernandez	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Levin (CA)	Schiff
Deutsch	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Dingell	Lieu	Schrader
Doggett	Lofgren	Schrier
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Scott (VA)
F.	Luria	Scott, David
Escobar	Lynch	Sewell
Eshoo	Malinowski	Sherman
Españolat	Maloney,	Sherrill
Evans	Carolyn B.	Sires
Fitzpatrick	Maloney, Sean	Slotkin
Fletcher	Manning	Smith (WA)
Foster	Matsui	Soto
Frankel, Lois	McBath	Spanberger
Gallego	McCollum	Speier
Garamendi	McEachin	Stansbury
Garcia (IL)	McGovern	Stanton
Garcia (TX)	McNerney	Stevens
Golden	Meeks	Strickland
Gomez	Meng	Suozzi
Gonzalez,	Mfume	Swalwell
Vicente	Moore (WI)	Takano
Gottheimer	Morelle	Thompson (CA)
Green, Al (TX)	Moulton	Thompson (MS)
Grijalva	Mrvan	Titus
Harder (CA)	Murphy (FL)	Tlaib
Hayes	Nadler	Tonko
Higgins (NY)	Napolitano	Torres (CA)
Himes	Neal	Torres (NY)
Horsford	Neguse	Trahan
Houlahan	Newman	Trone
Hoyer	Norcross	Underwood
Huffman	O'Halleran	Vargas
Jackson Lee	Ocasio-Cortez	Veasey
Jacobs (CA)	Omar	Vela
Jayapal	Pallone	Velázquez
Jeffries	Panetta	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Pappas	Schultz
Johnson (TX)	Pascrell	Waters
Jones	Payne	Watson Coleman
Kahele	Perlmutter	Welch
Kaptur	Peters	Wexton
Keating	Phillips	Wild
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Williams (GA)
Khanna	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Kildee	Porter	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—28

Arrington	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Banks	Guest	Norman
Buck	Herrell	Pfluger
Carter (GA)	Hice (GA)	Rose
Cloud	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Fulcher	Issa	Tiffany
Gallagher	Jackson	Weber (TX)
Garbarino	Johnson (LA)	Williams (TX)
Gohmert	Long	
Good (VA)	Miller (IL)	

□ 1840

Mr. VEASEY, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BASS, Messrs. COHEN, LIEU, and LOWENTHAL changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia and Mr. CARL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 194.

# MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)	Jackson Lee	Napolitano
Boebert (Gosar)	(Butterfield)	(Correa)
Bourdeaux	Jacobs (NY)	Owens (Curtis)
(Kuster)	(Garbarino)	Payne (Pallone)
Cárdenas	Johnson (TX)	Ruiz (Aguilar)
(Gomez)	(Jeffries)	Rush
Carl (Joyce (PA))	Kind (Connolly)	(Underwood)
Cawthorn (Nehls)	Kirkpatrick	Sewell (DelBene)
Clark (MA)	(Stanton)	Steube
(Kuster)	Lawson (FL)	(Franklin, C. Scott)
Cohen (Beyer)	(Evans)	Strickland
Fallon (Nehls)	Leger Fernandez	(DelBene)
Gallego (Gomez)	(Jacobs (CA))	Timmons Wilson
Garcia (IL)	Lieu (Beyer)	(FL)
(Gomez)	Lowenthal	Torres (NY)
Garcia (TX)	(Beyer)	(Jeffries)
(Jeffries)	McClain	Wilson (FL)
Grijalva	(Bergman)	(Hayes)
(Stanton)	Meng (Jeffries)	Young (Joyce)
Horsford	Mullin (Lucas)	(OH)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin). The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 182, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

YEAS—221

Adams	Craig	Huffman
Aguilar	Crist	Jackson Lee
Allred	Crow	Jacobs (CA)
Auchincloss	Cuellar	Jayapal
Axne	Davids (KS)	Jeffries
Barragán	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (GA)
Bass	Dean	Johnson (TX)
Beatty	DeFazio	Jones
Bera	DeGette	Kahele
Beyer	DeLauro	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Katko
Blumenauer	Delgado	Keating
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Khanna
Bourdeaux	Deutsch	Kildee
Bowman	Dingell	Kilmer
Boyle, Brendan	Doyle, Michael	Kim (NJ)
F.	F.	Kind
Brown	Escobar	Kirkpatrick
Brownley	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi
Bush	Españolat	Kuster
Bustos	Evans	Lamb
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick	Langevin
Carbajal	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Cárdenas	Foster	Larson (CT)
Carson	Frankel, Lois	Lawrence
Carter (LA)	Gallego	Lawson (FL)
Cartwright	Garamendi	Lee (CA)
Case	Garcia (IL)	Lee (NV)
Casten	Garcia (TX)	Leger Fernandez
Castro (FL)	Golden	Levin (CA)
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Chu	Gonzalez,	Lieu
Cicilline	Vicente	Lofgren
Clark (MA)	Gottheimer	Lowenthal
Clarke (NY)	Green, Al (TX)	
Cleaver	Grijalva	Lynch
Clyburn	Harder (CA)	Malinowski
Cohen	Hayes	Maloney,
Connolly	Higgins (NY)	Carolyn B.
Cooper	Himes	Maloney, Sean
Correa	Horsford	Manning
Costa	Houlahan	Matsui
Courtney	Hoyer	McBath



McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmuter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter

Pressley  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Rice (NY)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Sherrill  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Speier  
Stansbury

Stanton  
Stevens  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NAYS—182

Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Armstrong  
Babin  
Bacon  
Baird  
Balderson  
Barr  
Bentz  
Bergman  
Bice (OK)  
Biggs  
Billrakis  
Bishop (NC)  
Boebert  
Bost  
Brady  
Brooks  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Burgess  
Calvert  
Cammack  
Carl  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Cline  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Curtis  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Diaz-Balart  
Donalds  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Gaetz  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Gibbs

Gimenez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green (TN)  
Greene (GA)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Hagedorn  
Harris  
Harshbarger  
Hartzler  
Hern  
Herrera Beutler  
Hill  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Jacobs (NY)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (SD)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Joyce (PA)  
Keller  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kim (CA)  
Kinzinger  
Kustoff  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
LaTurner  
Lesko  
Letlow  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Mace  
Malliotakis  
Mann  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClain  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
Meijer  
Meuser  
Miller (WV)  
Miller-Meeks

Moolenaar  
Mooney  
Moore (UT)  
Mullin  
Murphy (NC)  
Nehls  
Newhouse  
Norman  
Nunes  
Obernolte  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pence  
Perry  
Posey  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (SC)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rosendale  
Rouzer  
Rutherford  
Salazar  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sessions  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smucker  
Spartz  
Stauber  
Steel  
Stefanik  
Steil  
Steube  
Stewart  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Timmons  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Van Duyne  
Wagner  
Walorski  
Waltz  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Young  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—27

Arrington  
Banks

Carter (GA)  
Cloud

DesJarlais  
Doggett

Fulcher  
Gallagher  
Gohmert  
Good (VA)  
Guest  
Herrell  
Hice (GA)

Higgins (LA)  
Issa  
Jackson  
Johnson (LA)  
Long  
Miller (IL)  
Moore (AL)

Pfluger  
Rose  
Roy  
Tiffany  
Walberg  
Weber (TX)  
Williams (TX)

□ 1902

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE  
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Babin (Nehls)  
Boebert (Gosar)  
Bourdeaux  
(Kuster)  
Cárdenas  
(Gomez)  
Carl (Joyce (PA))  
Cawthorn (Nehls)  
Clark (MA)  
(Kuster)  
Cohen (Beyer)  
Fallon (Nehls)  
Gallego (Gomez)  
Garcia (IL)  
(Gomez)  
Garcia (TX)  
(Jeffries)  
Grijalva  
(Stanton)  
Horsford  
(Jeffries)

Jackson Lee  
(Butterfield)  
Jacobs (NY)  
(Garbarino)  
Johnson (TX)  
(Jeffries)  
Kind (Connolly)  
Kirkpatrick  
(Stanton)  
Lawson (FL)  
(Evans)  
Leger Fernandez  
(Jacobs (CA))  
Lieu (Beyer)  
Lowenthal  
(Beyer)  
McClain  
(Bergman)  
Meng (Jeffries)  
Mullin (Lucas)  
Napolitano  
(Correa)

Norman (Wilson  
(SC))  
Owens (Curtis)  
Payne (Pallone)  
Ruiz (Aguilar)  
Rush  
(Underwood)  
Sewell (DelBene)  
Steube  
(Franklin, C.  
Scott)  
Strickland  
(DelBene)  
Timmons  
(Wilson (SC))  
Torres (NY)  
(Jeffries)  
Wilson (FL)  
(Hayes)  
Young (Joyce  
(OH))

REPLACEMENT OF BUST OF  
ROGER BROOKE TANEY WITH  
BUST OF THURGOOD MARSHALL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3005) to direct the Joint Committee on the Library to replace the bust of Roger Brooke Taney in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the United States Capitol with a bust of Thurgood Marshall to be obtained by the Joint Committee on the Library and to remove certain statues from areas of the United States Capitol which are accessible to the public, to remove all statues of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the United States Capitol, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 285, nays 120, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 196]

## YEAS—285

Adams  
Aguilar  
Allred  
Amodei  
Auchincloss  
Axne  
Bacon  
Balderson  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bentz  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bourdeaux  
Bowman  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brown  
Brownley  
Burgess  
Bush  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Cárdenas

Carson  
Carter (LA)  
Cartwright  
Case  
Casten  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen

Connolly  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Craig  
Crenshaw  
Crist  
Crow  
Cuellar  
Davids (KS)  
Davidson  
Davis, Danny K.  
Davis, Rodney  
Dean  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Delgado  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Emmer  
Escobar  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Fletcher  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel, Lois  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garbarino  
Garcia (CA)  
Garcia (IL)  
Garcia (TX)  
Gibbs  
Gimenez  
Golden  
Gomez  
Gonzales, Tony  
Gonzalez (OH)  
Gonzalez,  
Vicente  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al (TX)  
Grijalva  
Guthrie  
Harder (CA)  
Hayes  
Herrera Beutler  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Hinson  
Hollingsworth  
Horsford  
Houlahan  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Jackson Lee  
Jacobs (CA)  
Jacobs (NY)  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jones  
Joyce (OH)

Kahele  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kim (CA)  
Kim (NJ)  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Kirkpatrick  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster  
Lamb  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee (CA)  
Lee (NV)  
Leger Fernandez  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Lieu  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Luria  
Lynch  
Mace  
Malinowski  
Malliotakis  
Maloney  
Carolyn B.  
Manning  
Matsui  
McBath  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meijer  
Meng  
Mfume  
Moolenaar  
Moore (UT)  
Moore (WI)  
Morelle  
Moulton  
Mrvan  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (NC)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Neguse  
Newman  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
Ocasio-Cortez  
Omar  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pappas  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmuter  
Peters  
Phillips  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Porter  
Pressley

Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reed  
Reschenthaler  
Rice (NY)  
Rodgers (WA)  
Ross  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Scanlon  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schrier  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sewell  
Sherman  
Levin (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slotkin  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Spanberger  
Spartz  
Speier  
Stansbury  
Stanton  
Stauber  
Steil  
Stevens  
Stewart  
Strickland  
Suozi  
Swalwell  
Takano  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tlaib  
Tonko  
Torres (CA)  
Torres (NY)  
Trahan  
Trone  
Underwood  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Drew  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson Coleman  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Wexton  
Wild  
Williams (GA)  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young

## NAYS—120

Bucshon  
Budd  
Burchett  
Cammack  
Carl  
Carter (TX)  
Cawthorn  
Cline  
Clyde  
Cole  
Comer  
Crawford  
Curtis  
DesJarlais  
Donalds  
Duncan

Dunn  
Estes  
Fallon  
Feenstra  
Ferguson  
Fischbach  
Fitzgerald  
Fleischmann  
Franklin, C.  
Scott  
Gaetz  
Gooden (TX)  
Gosar  
Granger  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)